REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement of November 24, 2004, Applicants cancel claims 32-50, and respectfully traverse the restriction requirement. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested based on at least the following reasons:

1. The restriction requirement between group I (claims 1-16 and 40-46) and group II (claims 17-31) is improper because the two groups are not patentably distinct from each other and are not separately usable as required by MPEP 806.05(d). In particular, claim 1 from group I does not have a separate use from claim 17 of group II. Claim 1 from group I recites:

1. A method for interacting with an information repository, the repository characterized as an object space, a user accessing said object space through a network interface, the method comprising the steps of:

establishing a relevance interface, the interface adaptively defining a collection of content pointers, each content pointer corresponding to an object within the space, the collection organized as a grouping of sets of indicia, the relevance interface overlaying and cooperating with said network interface;

generating at least one subject keyword;

searching the object space with said network interface, in accordance with the keyword query;

retrieving objects from the object space, each retrieved object associated with the query keyword; and

organizing retrieved objects in accordance with a context derived from the relevance interface, retrieved objects displayed to a user over the network interface in a ranking order corresponding to said context derived organization.

In comparison, claim 17 from group II recites:

17. A method for interacting with an information repository, the repository characterized as an object space, a user accessing said object space through a network interface, the method comprising the steps of:

establishing a relevance interface, the interface adaptively defining a collection of content pointers, each content pointer corresponding to an object within the space, the collection organized as a context relevant hierarchy, the relevance interface overlaying and cooperating with said network interface;

browsing through a plurality of objects within the object space with said relevance interface;

accessing particular ones of said objects; and

assigning each such accessed object to a position within the context relevant hierarchy.

The underlined emphasis is added merely to identify the point of similarity between claims 1 and 17, with respect to browsing (or searching) through objects within an object space and retrieving (or accessing) particular objects within the object space. The Examiner has not shown as required by MPEP 808.02 that either a) the subject matter of claims 1 and 17 require separate classification; or b) that the subject matter of the claims has attained recognition in the art as separate subjects of inventive effort; or c) that it would be necessary to search separate fields; indeed any search for art related to the subject matter of claim 1 would be pertinent to the subject matter of claim 17, and vice versa, given their similarity.

Applicants further note the definition of a combination and subcombination from MPEP 806.05(a): "A combination is an organization of which a subcombination or element is a part." The Examiner asserted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action that the inventions of Group I and Groups II are "related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination," which triggers application of MPEP 806.05(d). The Examiner then applied the test laid out in MPEP 806.05(d).

But the premise of the Examiner's argument is incorrect. Groups I and II are *not* related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. For the Groups to be usable together in a single combination, there would have to be disclosed a *single combination*, i.e., one that contains *every* element of Groups I and II. See MPEP 806.05(a). In view of the Groups as independently claimed, such a combination is not disclosed. Moreover, the Groups are drawn to processes that perform similar tasks in a similar manner — such as browsing (or searching) through objects within an object space and retrieving (or accessing) particular objects within the object space — so there is no reason to suggest that the Groups are *"usable together* in

a single combination" under the meaning of MPEP 806.05(d). The restriction requirement is therefore improper.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Groups I and II are drawn to substantially the same subject matter and no undue burden of search is imposed upon the Examiner by examining these two groups, including claims 1-31. Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement between groups II and I be withdrawn.

As required by procedure, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group II. Applicants has in this response canceled claims 32-50 from groups II and IV. This election includes claims 17-31 and Applicants request that claims 1-16 and 40-46 be retained in this patent application, unexamined, pending allowance.

Reconsideration and favorable action are solicited.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Donald R. Turnball and Hinrich Schuetze

Date: 2/24/05   By: _____

Andrew Israel, Reg. No. 52,447
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7805
Fax: (650) 938-5200